

am



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/998,043	11/29/2001	Flemming Boegelund	AUS920010680US1	6059

7590 03/31/2006
Darcell Walker
8107 Carvel Lane
Houston, TX 77036

EXAMINER

ALBERTALLI, BRIAN LOUIS

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2626

DATE MAILED: 03/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/998,043

Applicant(s)

BOEGELUND ET AL.

Examiner

Brian L. Albertalli

Art Unit

2626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 January 2006.
2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-30 is/are rejected.
7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments filed January 21, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
2. Regarding the amendment to claim 20 to overcome the rejections of claims 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. 101, the amendment is insufficient to render claims 20-30 statutory subject matter. The Applicant has amended the specification to define "computer readable medium" as "storage medium, paper, and transmission type media. Initially, the introduction of the amendment to the specification introduces new matter, an objection to the specification under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) is given below. Additionally, the Applicant's defined "computer readable storage medium" still fails to meet the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 101.

"Transmission media" is unpatentable subject matter because transmission media includes "signals" *per se* which are not a patentable category of invention under 35 U.S.C. 101 (i.e. process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter).

Furthermore, a "computer program product", even if encoded in a computer readable storage medium, must permit the computer program's functionality to be realized (i.e. by being positively recited as being "executable" by a computer).

Still further, though the Applicant has claimed "instructions" for performing various acts, the "instructions" are not necessarily computer program instructions, as claimed, and thus the claimed "instructions" do not necessarily permit the computer program's functionality to be realized.

For at least these reasons, the rejections of claims 20-30 under 35 U.S.C. 101 are maintained.

3. Regarding the Applicant's arguments that the Applicant's invention is a "batch process" that is "not the same parallel creation and translation process described in Chou", firstly, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., batch processing) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

Secondly, Applicant's arguments fail to comply with 37 CFR 1.111(b) because they amount to a general allegation that the claims define a patentable invention without specifically pointing out how the language of the claims patentably distinguishes them from the references.

4. Regarding the Applicant's arguments concerning the use of Applicant's Admitted Prior Art, the Examiner did not rely on "a particular technique" described in the Applicant's specification that was a technique "of the applicant's present invention". Rather, the rejection is based on the fact that Chou teaches the translation of any application program that is to be executed on a computer. Chou simply does not specifically mention "presentation programs" (e.g. Microsoft's PowerPoint program). The relied upon portions of the Applicant's specification explicitly recite that presentation program modules are "currently available" (i.e. at the time of invention). Therefore, the

reliance on the Applicant's Admitted Prior Art is not a reliance on any "particular technique" which may be part of the Applicant's invention, but simply that "presentation programs" as recited in the claims were known at the time of invention.

Therefore, given that "presentation programs" were "currently available" and thus known to others at the time of invention, It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

5. For the reasons given above, the rejections of claims 1-30 are maintained.

Specification

6. The amendment filed January 21, 2006 is objected to under 35 U.S.C. 132(a) because it introduces new matter into the disclosure. 35 U.S.C. 132(a) states that no amendment shall introduce new matter into the disclosure of the invention. The added material which is not supported by the original disclosure is as follows: "The computer readable medium includes storage medium, paper, and transmission-type media".

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office Action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

7. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

8. Claims 20-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

See explanation above under Response to Arguments.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 1-6, 10-23, and 27-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou (U.S. Patent 5,583,761), in view of Applicant's admitted prior art.

In regard to claims 1 and 20, Chou discloses a computer implemented method and instructions for translating text on a slide presentation from a first language to a second language comprising the steps of/instructions for:

creating a text file (Fig. 6, ORISTSRING.LST), the text file having a format that can enable text be translated from one language to a second language using conventional file translation techniques (column 8, lines 10-14 and lines 53-55);

inserting text from an original application presentation into the created text file (screen capture 61 and string selection 62 extracts text from the application presentation, column 8, lines 4-14, lines 35-38, and lines 48-50);

translating the text inserted into the text file from a first language to a second language (column 8, lines 14-16 and column 9, lines 7-10); and

writing the translated text onto the original application presentation, in the location of the original text that was translated, using information contained in the original application presentation (the TARSTRING.LST file contains the position information of the original text for displaying the translated text in the same position, column 9, lines 13-14 and column 10, lines 8-14).

Chou further discloses that this method is applied to any available application program (see Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 64-67). Chou additionally suggests that application programs with text in one language limits the usefulness of the application with users who do not have sufficient skills to understand that language (column 1, lines 31-34).

Chou does not disclose that the application is a "presentation program" (such as PowerPoint TM) for presenting "presentation slides".

The Applicant's admitted prior art discloses presentation programs are in wide use and provide a specially designed, user friendly pallet of tools to assist in the creation of presentation slides to be subsequently displayed to an audience, and further allow the slides to be sequentially presented to an audience, point-by-point and slide-

by-slide, with color, animation, audio, and transition effects that enrich and enliven the presentation (Specification, page 1, lines 19-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claim 2, Chou discloses said addressing information related to the configuration of the objects contained in the original application presentation is inserted into the created text file, at a location transparent to a user (Fig. 8C, the location coordinates of the original text is inserted in the ORISTSRING.LST file, column 10, lines 3-5).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 3 and 21, Chou discloses, before said file creation step/instructions, the steps of/instructions for:

obtaining the original application presentation for which translation is desired (Fig. 6, Application Screen, column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 1);

obtaining the translation language for the application presentation (the language is designated during the application selection step, column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 1); and

retrieving the text to be translated from the original application presentation (screen capture 61 and string selection 62 extracts text from the application presentation, column 8, lines 4-14, lines 35-38, and lines 48-50).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 4 and 22, Chou discloses said text retrieving step/instructions comprises reading the text from the original application presentation (screen capture 61 and string selection 62 extracts text from the application presentation, column 8, lines 4-14, lines 35-38, and lines 48-50).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a “presentation slide”, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a “presentation program”, where the application presentation was a “presentation slide”, in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 5 and 23, Chou discloses copying text from the original application presentation (text is copied into the ORISTRING.LST file, column 8, lines 4-14, lines 35-38, and lines 48-50).

In regard to claim 6, Chou discloses the addressing information is extracted from the original application presentation (column 9, lines 1-3 and column 10, lines 8-14).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a “presentation slide”, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a “presentation program”, where the application presentation was a “presentation slide”, in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 10 and 27, Chou discloses said translated application presentation writing step/instructions comprises:

creating a copy of an original application presentation (the screen is captured to the SCREEN.CAP file, column 8, lines 7-9, lines 35-38, and line 45);

retrieving the translated text information from the new text file (Fig. 6, poster 65, information in TARSTRING.LST, column 9, lines 36-40 and lines 49-50);

retrieving other presentation information from the original application presentation (original presentation coordinates extracted from the original application presentation are retrieved, column 10, lines 10-14); and

inserting the translated text information and the other application presentation information onto the created copy of the original application presentation such that the inserted information appears in the copy of the application presentation original in the same configuration as in the original application presentation (column 10, lines 10-14).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 11 and 28, Chou discloses said insertion step/instructions comprises inserting and positioning said translated text and other original presentation information in the copy of the original application presentation according to the addressing information for the original application presentation (the position coordinates

of the original text are used to position the translated text, column 10, lines 3-14). Chou further discloses that this method is applied to any available application program (see Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 64-67). Chou additionally suggests that application programs with text in one language limits the usefulness of the application with users who do not have sufficient skills to understand that language (column 1, lines 31-34).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claim 12, Chou discloses the addressing information contained in the text file is not translated from the first language to the second language (see Fig. 8C and 8D, position coordinates are not translated).

In regard to claim 13, Chou discloses:

creating a specific identification for the new translated application presentation (translated screens are each captured and stored in separate files, which must necessarily have a specific identification, e.g. a filename, column 4, lines 32-37);

attaching a link from the new translated application presentation to the original application presentation (the original and translated images are associated with the given application, column 4, lines 35-37); and

storing the translated application presentation in a translated slide database for the second language (as files, column 4, lines 32-37). Chou further discloses that this method is applied to any available application program (see Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 64-67). Chou additionally suggests that application programs with text in one language limits the usefulness of the application with users who do not have sufficient skills to understand that language (column 1, lines 31-34).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claim 14, Chou discloses before said new text file creation step, the step of examining links of an original application presentation to determine if a translated application presentation for the particular language currently exists and retrieving an existing translated application presentation (when a particular screen display request is received, the image is retrieved from the structured storage area if the correct translated slide exists, column 7, lines 5-14).

As discussed in reference to claims 1 and 20, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claim 15, Chou discloses a computer implemented method for translating text on an application presentation from a first language to a second language comprising the steps of:

- creating a copy of an original application presentation (the screen is captured to the SCREEN.CAP file, column 8, lines 7-9, lines 35-38, and line 45);

- creating a text file, the text file having a format that can enable text be translated from one language to a second language using conventional file translation techniques (ORISTRING.LST, column 8, lines 10-14 and lines 53-55);

- inserting text from the copy of an original application presentation into the created text file (screen capture 61 and string selection 62 extracts text from the application presentation, column 8, lines 4-14, lines 35-38, and lines 48-50);

- translating the text inserted into the text file from a first language to a second language (column 8, lines 14-16 and column 9, lines 7-10); and

- writing the translated text onto the created copy of the original application presentation, in the location of the original text that was translated, using information

contained in the original application presentation (the TARSTRING.LST file contains the position information of the original text for displaying the translated text in the same position, column 9, lines 13-14 and column 10, lines 8-14).

Chou further discloses that this method is applied to any available application program (see Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 64-67). Chou additionally suggests that application programs with text in one language limits the usefulness of the application with users who do not have sufficient skills to understand that language (column 1, lines 31-34).

Chou does not disclose that the application is a "presentation program" (such as PowerPoint TM) for presenting "presentation slides".

The Applicant's admitted prior art discloses presentation programs are in wide use and provide a specially designed, user friendly pallet of tools to assist in the creation of presentation slides to be subsequently displayed to an audience, and further allow the slides to be sequentially presented to an audience, point-by-point and slide-by-slide, with color, animation, audio, and transition effects that enrich and enliven the presentation (Specification, page 1, lines 19-27).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claim 16, Chou discloses, before said file creation step, the steps of:
obtaining the original application presentation for which translation is desired
(Fig. 6, Application Screen, column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 1);
obtaining the translation language for the application presentation (the language is designated during the application selection step, column 7, line 65 to column 8, line 1); and
retrieving the text to be translated from the original application presentation
(screen capture 61 and string selection 62 extracts text from the application presentation, column 8, lines 4-14, lines 35-38, and lines 48-50).

As discussed in reference to claim 15, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claim 17, Chou discloses said translated application presentation writing step comprises:

retrieving the translated text information from the new text file (Fig. 6, poster 65, information in TARSTRING.LST, column 9, lines 36-40 and lines 49-50);
inserting the translated text information and the other application presentation information onto the created copy of the original application presentation such that the

inserted information appears in the copy of the application presentation original in the same configuration as in the original application presentation (column 10, lines 10-14).

As discussed in reference to claim 15, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 18 and 29, Chou discloses steps/instructions for:

creating a specific identification for the new translated application presentation (translated screens are each captured and stored in separate files, which must necessarily have a specific identification, e.g. a filename, column 4, lines 32-37);

attaching a link from the new translated application presentation to the original application presentation (the original and translated images are associated with the given application, column 4, lines 35-37); and

storing the translated application presentation in a translated slide database for the second language (as files, column 4, lines 32-37). Chou further discloses that this method is applied to any available application program (see Fig. 1 and column 1, lines 64-67). Chou additionally suggests that application programs with text in one language limits the usefulness of the application with users who do not have sufficient skills to understand that language (column 1, lines 31-34).

As discussed in reference to claim 15, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

In regard to claims 19 and 30, Chou discloses before said new text file creation step/instructions, the step/instructions for examining links of an original application presentation to determine if a translated application presentation for the particular language currently exists and retrieving an existing translated application presentation (when a particular screen display request is received, the image is retrieved from the structured storage area if the correct translated slide exists, column 7, lines 5-14).

As discussed in reference to claim 15, above, while Chou does not disclose the application presentation is a "presentation slide", it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to implement the method disclosed by Chou where the application program (Fig. 1) was a "presentation program", where the application presentation was a "presentation slide", in order to provide a presentation in a language most suited to the intended audience.

11. Claims 7-9 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Chou, in view of Applicant's admitted prior art, and further in view of Rosenbaum (U.S. Patent 5,404,435).

In regard to claims 7 and 24, while the combination of Chou and Applicant's admitted prior art disclose searching presentation slides for text and exporting the found text object's addressing information, Chou and Applicant's admitted prior art do not disclose the steps of/instructions for:

- searching the slide presentation for objects;
- determining whether a found object is a text object; and
- exporting the text from the found text.

Rosenbaum disclose a method and instructions (Fig. 3) for extracting text from documents that contain text and non-text objects such as image objects, voice objects, video objects, and animation objects, comprising:

- searching the document for objects (step 306, text object archiving routine, locate text object, step 1208, column 15, lines 57-58);

- determining whether a found object is a text object (step 1208 locates only text objects, so a decision whether a given object is a text object must necessarily be made, column 15, lines 57-58); and

- exporting the text from the found text object (text from the found text object is extracted, column 15, line 64).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify the combination of Chou and Applicant's admitted prior art to

Art Unit: 2626

search through the presentation slide for text objects and extract the text, so that relevant text would automatically be extracted from the presentation slide without the need for further user input.

Further with regard to claims 8, 9, 24, and 25, Rosenbaum discloses every text object in the document is found to extract text information from the text object (see step 1232, process repeats until no more text objects are found in the document, column 16, lines 19-20).

Therefore, the method/instructions disclosed by Rosenbaum would necessarily:

- determine whether the found object is a group;
- search each sub-object in a determined group for text;
- export the text from each sub-object found in the group; and
- repeat said searching and exporting steps for each sub-object determined to be in the determined group;

and would additionally continue to search until the lowest level object on the slide was detected.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of invention to further modify the combination of Chou and Applicant's admitted prior art to search every single text object in a presentation slide, by searching through subgroups and continuing until the lowest level object in the slide was detected, so that all of the textual information in the presentation slide would be translated into the desired language.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of this final action.


13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Brian L. Albertalli whose telephone number is (571) 272-7616. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon - Fri, 8:00 AM - 5:30 PM, every second Fri off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Hudspeth can be reached on (571) 272-7843. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2626

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

BLA 3/28/06



DAVID HUDSPETH
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600